arXiv:hep-th/9308028v1 6 Aug 1993

ZETA-FUNCTION REGULARIZATION IS UNIQUELY DEFINED AND WELL

E. Elizalde[1]
Division of Applied Mechanics, Norwegian Institute of Technology,
University of Trondheim, N-7034 Trondheim, Norway

Abstract

Hawking's zeta function regularization procedure is shown to be rigorously and uniquely defined, thus putting and end to the spreading lore about different difficulties associated with it. Basic misconceptions, misunderstandings and errors which keep appearing in important scientific journals when dealing with this beautiful regularization method —and other analytical procedures— are clarified and corrected.

PACS numbers: 03.70.+k, 04.20.Cv, 11.10.Gh

[1]On leave of absence from and permanent address: Department E.C.M., Faculty of Physics, Barcelona University, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain; e-mail: eli @ ebubecm1.bitnet

This letter is a defense of Hawking's zeta function regularization method [1], against the different criticisms which have been published in important scientific journals and which seem to conclude (sometimes with exagerated emphasis) that the procedure is ambiguous, ill defined, and that it possesses even more problems than the well known ones which afflict e.g. dimensional regularization. Our main purpose is to clarify, once and for all, some basic concepts, misunderstandings, and also errors which keep appearing in the physical literature, about this method of zeta function regularization and other analytical regularization procedures. The situation is such that, what is in fact a most elegant, well defined, and unique —in many respects— regularization method, may look now to the non-specialist as just one more among many possible regularization procedures, plagued with difficulties and illdefiniteness.

We shall not review here in detail the essentials of the method, nor give an exhaustive list of the papers that have pointed out 'difficulties with the zeta function procedure'. For this purpose we refer the specialized reader to a book scheduled to appear towards the end of 1993 [2]. Instead, we shall restrict ourselves to some specific points which are at the very heart of the matter and which may be interesting to a much broader audience.

The method of zeta function regularization is uniquely defined in the following way. Take the Hamiltonian, H, corresponding to our quantum system, plus boundary conditions, plus possible background field and including a possibly non-trivial metric (because we may live in a curved spacetime). In mathematical terms, all this boils down to a (second order, elliptic) differential operator, A, plus corresponding boundary conditions. The spectrum of this operator A may or may not be calculable explicitly, and in the first case may or may not exhibit a beautiful regularity in terms of powers of natural numbers. Whatever be the situation, it is a well stablished mathematical theorem that to *any* such operator a *zeta function*, ζ_A, can be defined in a rigorous way. The formal expression of this definition is:

$$\zeta_A(s) = \mathrm{Tr}\, e^{-s \ln A}. \tag{1}$$

Let us stress that this is completely *general*. Moreover, the present is by no means the only kind of zeta function known to the mathematicians, for whom this concept has a wider character (see, for instance [3]). The zeta function $\zeta_A(s)$ is generally a meromorphic function (develops only poles) in the complex plane, $s \in \mathrm{C}$. Its calculation usually requires complex integration around some circuit in the complex plane, the use of the Mellin transform, and the calculation of invariants of the spacetime metric (the Hadamard-Minakshisundaram-Pleyel-Seeley-DeWitt-Gilkey-... coefficients) [4].

In the particular case when the eigenvalues of the differential operator A —what is equivalent, the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian (with the boundary conditions, etc. taken into acount)— can be calculated explicitly (let us call them λ_n and assume they form a discrete set), the expression of the zeta function is given by:

$$\zeta_A(s) = \sum_n \lambda_n^{-s}. \tag{2}$$

Now, as a particular case of this (already particular) case, when the eigenvalues are of one of the forms: (i) an, (ii) $a(n+b)$ or (iii) $a(n^2+b^2)$, we obtain, respectively, the so-called (i) (ordinary) Riemann zeta function ζ_R (or simply ζ), (ii) Hurwitz (or generalized Riemann) zeta function ζ_H, and (iii) (a specific case of the) Epstein-Hurwitz zeta function ζ_{EH} [3]. Finally, depending on the physical magnitude to be calculated, the zeta function must be evaluated at a certain particular value of s. For instance, if we are interested in the vacuum or Casimir energy, which is simply given as the sum over the spectrum:

$$E_C = \frac{\hbar}{2} \sum_n \lambda_n, \tag{3}$$

this will be given by the corresponding zeta function evaluated at $s = -1$:

$$E_C = \frac{\hbar}{2} \zeta_A(-1). \tag{4}$$

Normally, the series (3) will be divergent, and this will involve an analytic continuation through the zeta function. That is why such regularization can be termed as a particular case of analytic continuation procedure. In summary, the zeta function of the quantum system is a very general, uniquely defined, rigorous mathematical concept, which does not admit either interpretations nor ambiguities.

Let us now come down to the concrete situations which have motivated this article. In Ref. [5], when calculating the Casimir energy of a piecewise uniform closed string, Brevik and Nielsen where confronted with the following expression ([5], Eq. (52))

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+\beta), \tag{5}$$

which is clearly infinite. Here, the zeta-function regularization procedure consists in the following. This expressions comes about as the sum over the eigenvalues $n+\beta$ of the Hamiltonian of a certain quantum system (here the transverse oscillations of the mentioned string), i.e. $\lambda_n = n+\beta$. There is little doubt about what to do: as clearly stated above, the corresponding zeta function is

$$\zeta_A(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+\beta)^{-s}. \tag{6}$$

Now, for Re $s > 1$ this is the expression of the Hurwitz zeta function $\zeta_H(s;\beta)$, which can be analytically continued as a meromorphic function to the whole complex plane. Thus, the zeta function regularization method unambiguously prescribes that the sum under consideration should be assigned the following value

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+\beta) = \zeta_H(-1;\beta). \tag{7}$$

The wrong alternative (for obvious reasons, after all what has been said before), would be to argue that 'we might as well have written

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n+\beta) = \zeta_R(-1) + \beta\zeta_R(0), \tag{8}$$

what gives a different result'. In fact, that 'the Hurwitz zeta function (and not the ordinary Riemann)' was the one 'to be used' was recognized by Li et al. [6], who reproduced in this way the correct result obtained by Brevik and Nielsen by means of a (more conventional) exponential cutoff regularization. However, the authors of [6] were again misunderstanding the main issue when they considered their method as being a *generalization* of the zeta regularization procedure (maybe just because the generalized Riemann zeta function appears!). Quite on the contrary, this is just a *specific and particularly simple* application of the zeta function regularization procedure .

Of course, the method can be viewed as just one of the many possibilities of analytic continuation in order to give sense to (i.e., to regularize) infinite expressions. From this point of view, it is very much related with the standard dimensional regularization method. In a very recent paper, [7], Svaiter and Svaiter have argued that, being so close relatives, these two procedures even share the same type of diseases. But precisely to cure the problem of the dependence of the regularized result on the kind of the extra dimensions (artificially introduced in dimensional regularization) was —let us recall— one of the main motivations of Hawking for the introduction of a new procedure, i.e. zeta function regularization, in physics [1]. So we seem to have been caught in a devil's staircase.

The solution to this paradox is the following. Actually, there is no error in the examples of Ref. [7] and the authors know perfectly what they are doing, but their interpretation of the results may originate a big deal of confusion among non-specialists. To begin with, it might look at first sight as if the concept itself of analytical continuation would *not* be *uniquely* defined. Given a function in some domain of the complex plane (here, normally, a part of the real line or the half plane Re $s > a$, being a some abscisa of convergence), its

analytic continuation to the rest of the complex plane (in our case, usually as a meromorphic function, but this need not in general be so) *is* uniquely defined. Put it plain, a function *cannot* have two different analytic continuations. What Svaiter and Svaiter do in their examples is simply to start in each case from two different functions of s and then continue each of them analytically. Of course, the result is different. In particular, these functions are

$$f_1(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^{-s} \tag{9}$$

vs.

$$f_2(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{n}{a} + 1\right)^{-(s+1)} \tag{10}$$

continued to $s = -1$, in the first example, which corresponds to a Hermitian massless conformal scalar field in 2d Minkowski spacetime with a compactified dimension, and

$$g_1(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^{-3s} \tag{11}$$

continued to $s = -1$, vs.

$$g_2(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^3 \left(\frac{n}{a} + 1\right)^{-s}, \tag{12}$$

continued to $s = 0$, in the second example, in which the vacuum energy corresponding to a conformally coupled scalar field in an Einstein universe is studied. Needless to say, the number of posibilites to define 'different analytic continuations' in this way is literally infinite. What use can one make of them remains to be seen.

However, what is absolutely misleading is to conclude from those examples that analytical regularizations 'suffer from the same problem as dimensional regularization', precisely the one that Hawking wanted to cure!. This has no meaning. In the end, also dimensional regularization is an analytical procedure! One must realize that zeta function regularization is perfectly well defined, and has little to do with these arbitrary analytic continuations '*à la* ζ' in which one changes at will any exponent at any place with the only restriction that one recovers the starting expression for a particular value of the exponent s.

The facts are as follows. (i) There exist infinitely many different analytic regularization procedures, being dimensional regularization and zeta function regularization just two of them. (ii) Zeta function regularization is, as we have seen, a specifically defined procedure, provides a unique analytical continuation and (sometimes) a finite result. (iii) Therefore, zeta function regularization does not suffer, in any way, from the same kind of problem (or a related one) as dimensional regularization. (iv) This does not mean, however, that zeta

function regularization has *no* problems, but they are of a different kind; the first appears already when it turns out that the point (let say $s = -1$ or $s = 0$) at which the zeta function must be evaluated turns out to be precisely a *pole* of the analytic continuation. This and similar difficulties can be solved, as discussed in detail in Ref. [8]. Eventually, as a final step one has to resort to renormalization group techniques [9]. (v) Zeta function regularization has been extended to higher loop order by McKeon and Sherry under the name of operator regularization and there also some difficulties (concerning the breaking of gauge invariance) appear [10]. (vi) But, in the end, the fundamental question is: which of the regularizations that are being used is *the one* choosen by nature? In practice, one always tries to avoid answering this question, by cheking the finite results obtained with different regularizations and by comparing them with classical limits which provide well-known, physically meaningful values. However, one would be led to believe that in view of its uniqueness, naturalness and mathematical elegance, zeta function regularization could well be *the one*. Those properties are certainly to be counted among their main virtues, but (oddly enough) in some sense also as its drawbacks: we do not manage to see clearly how and what infinites are thrown away, something that is evident in other more pedestrial regularizations (which are actually equivalent in some cases to the zeta one, as pointed out, e.g., in [7]).

The final issue of this paper will concern the practical application of the procedure. Actually, aside from some very simple cases (among those, the ones reviewed here), the use of the procedure of analytic continuation through the zeta function requires a good deal of mathematical work [2]. It is no surprise that has been so often associated with mistakes and errors [11]. One which often repeates itself can be traced back to Eq. (1.70) of the celebrated book by Mostepanenko and Trunov [12] on the Casimir effect:

$$\frac{a^2}{\pi^2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(n^2+\frac{a^2m^2}{\pi^2}\right)^{-1}=\frac{1}{2m^2}\left(-1+\frac{am}{\pi}\coth\frac{am}{\pi}\right), \tag{13}$$

in other words (for $a = \pi$ and $m = c$),

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(n^2+c^2\right)^{-1}=\frac{1}{2c^2}\left(-1+c\coth c\right). \tag{14}$$

That Eq. (13) is not right can be observed by simple inspection. The corrected formula reads

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\pi^2n^2+c^2\right)^{-1}=\frac{1}{2c^2}\left(-1+c\coth c\right). \tag{15}$$

The integrated version of this equality, namely,

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\ln\left(n^2+c^2/\pi^2\right)=2c+2\ln\left(1-e^{-2c}\right), \tag{16}$$

under the specific form

$$T\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\ln\left[(\omega_n)^2+(q_l)^2\right]=q_l+2T\ln\left(1-e^{-q_l/T}\right), \tag{17}$$

with $\omega_n=2\pi nT$ and $q_l=\pi l/R$, has been used by Antillón and Germán in a very recent paper ([13], Eq. (2.20)), when studying the Nambu-Goto string model at finite length and non-zero temperature. Now this equality is again formal. It involves an analytic continuation, since it has no sense to integrate the lhs term by term: we get a divergent series.

A rigorous way to proceed is as follows. The expression on the left hand side happens to be the most simple form of the inhomogeneous Epstein zeta function (called usually Epstein-Hurwitz zeta function [4]). This function is quite involved and different expresions for it (including asymptotical expansions very useful for accurate numerical calculations) have been given in [14] (see also [15]). In particular

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{EH}(s;c^2)&=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(n^2+c^2\right)^{-s}\\&=-\frac{c^{-2s}}{2}+\frac{\sqrt{\pi}\,\Gamma(s-1/2)}{2\Gamma(s)}c^{-2s+1}+\frac{2\pi^s c^{-s+1/2}}{\Gamma(s)}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^{s-1/2}K_{s-1/2}(2\pi nc),\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which is reminiscent of the famous Chowla-Selberg formula (see [3], p. 1379). Derivatives can be taken here and the analytical continuation in s presents again no problem.

The usefulness of zeta function regularization is without question [16,2,4]. It can give immediate sense to expressions such as $1+1+1+\cdots=-1/2$, which turn out to be invaluable for the construction of new physical theories, as different as Pauli-Villars regularization with infinite constants (advocated by Slavnov [17]) and mass generation in cosmology through Landau poles (used by Yndurain [18]). The Riemann zeta function was termed by Hilbert in his famous 1900 lecture as the most important function of whole mathematics [19]. Probably it will remain so in the Paris Congress of AD 2000, but now maybe with quantum field physics adhered to.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Prof. I. Brevik and to Prof. K. Olaussen for many illuminating discussions and also to them and to Prof. L. Brink for the hospitality extended to me at the Universities of Trondheim and Göteborg, respectively. This work has been supported by DGICYT (Spain) and by CIRIT (Generalitat de Catalunya).

References

[1] S.W. Hawking, Commun. Math Phys. **55**, 133 (1977); J.S. Dowker and R. Critchley, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 3224 (1976); L.S. Brown and G.J. MacLay, Phys. Rev. **184**, 1272 (1969).

[2] E. Elizalde, S.D. Odintsov, A. Romeo, A.A. Bytsenko, and S. Zerbini, *Zeta regularization techniques with applications*, World Sci., to be published.

[3] S. Iyanaga and Y. Kawada, Eds., *Encyclopedic dictionary of mathematics*, Vol. II (The MIT press, Cambridge, 1977), p. 1372 ff.

[4] E. Elizalde, S. Leseduarte, and S. Zerbini, *Mellin transform techniques for zeta-function resummations*, Univ. of Barcelona preprint, UB-ECM-PF 93/7 (1993).

[5] I. Brevik and H.B. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1185 (1990).

[6] X. Li, X, Shi, and J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 560 (1991).

[7] B.F. Svaiter and N.F. Svaiter, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4581 (1993).

[8] S.K. Blau, M. Visser, and A. Wipf, Nucl. Phys. **B310**, 163 (1988).

[9] E. Elizalde and K. Kirsten, to be published.

[10] D.G.C. McKeon and T.N. Sherry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 532 (1987); Phys. Rev. **D35**, 3854 (1987); A. Rheban, Phys. Rev. **D39**, 3101 (1989).

[11] E. Elizalde and A. Romeo, Phys. Rev. **D40**, 436 (1989).

[12] Mostepanenko and Trunov, *The casimir effect* (in russian), Atomiadz, Moscow, 1991.

[13] A. Antillón and G. Germán, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4567 (1993).

[14] E. Elizalde, J. Math. Phys. **31**, 170 (1990).

[15] I. Brevik and I. Clausen, PÆS3hys. Rev. **D39**, 603 (1989).

[16] A. Actor, J. Phys. **A24**, 3741 (1991); D.M. McAvity and H. Osborn, Cambridge preprint DAMTP/92-31 (1992), to be published in Nucl. Phys. B.

[17] A. Slavnov, to be published.

[18] F. Yndurain, to be published.

[19] C. Reid, *Hilbert* (Springer, Berlin, 1970), p. 82.